



<u>s Smisko</u> DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI

Plaintiff,

V.
STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

V.
STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PROHIBIT PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT

Defendant.

The State of Arizona, by and through Sheila Sullivan Polk, Yavapai County Attorney, and her deputy undersigned, hereby submits its Response to Defendant's Motion *in Limine* to Prohibit Prosecutorial Misconduct and requests not only that the request be denied but that defense counsel be admonished for wasting the limited resources of all parties on such an unnecessary pleading.

Defendant offers numerous statements made by a the prosecutor as evidence of improper arguments; however, these comments were not improper given the circumstances under which they were made. As to any comments made by the undersigned counsel during the *Bocharski* resentencing, on automatic appeal, the Arizona Supreme Court stated "[o]ur thorough review of the record discloses no action by the prosecutor that we regard as

constituting misconduct." State v. Bocharski, (Bocharski II), 218 Ariz. 476, 492, 189 P.3d 403, 419(2008).

As the United States Supreme Court long ago recognized, the prosecutor

is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold aim of is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor-indeed, he should do so. But, while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one.

Berger v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 88, 55 S.Ct. 629, 633 (1935).

Arizona codified the special responsibilities of a prosecutor in the *Rules of the Arizona*Supreme Court, ER 3.8 and the undersigned prosecutor is well-versed with those responsibilities. Whereas the prosecutor does not need an Order from this Court to acknowledge his is bound by the special responsibilities assigned to his position, Defendant's request for such an Order should be denied.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of January, 2010.

Sheila Sullivan Polk

YAVAPAL COUNTY ATTORNEY

Joseph C. Butner

Deputy County Attorney

///

| //,

COPIES of the foregoing delivered this 1 day of January, 2010 to: 2 Honorable Thomas J. Lindberg 3 Division 6 Yavapai County Superior Court (via email) 5 John Sears 6 107 North Cortez Street, Suite 104 Prescott, AZ 86301 7 Attorney for Defendant (via email) Facsimile: (928) 771-3110 Larry Hammond Anne Chapman 10 Osborn Maledon, P.A. 2929 North Central Ave, 21st Floor 11 Phoenix, AZ Attorney for Defendant 12 (via email) 13 By: Web Cowell Phone: (928) 771-3344 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Office of the Yavapai County Attorney

255 E. Gurley Street, Suite 300

Prescott, AZ 86301

26